

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 29-55 are pending in this Application.

By this Amendment, claims 29-32, 33, 34, 37-40, 42, 43, 46-49, 51, and 52 are currently amended. Claims 35, 44, and 54 have been canceled. Applicants respectfully submit that support for the claim amendments can be found throughout the specification and the drawings.

Claims 29-34, 36-43, 45-53, and 55 remain pending in the Application after entry of this Amendment. No new matter has been entered.

In the Office Action, claims 29-55 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,301,586 (hereinafter “Yang”).

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S. C. § 102(e)

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 29-55 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on Yang.

Applicants respectfully note that to anticipate a pending claim, a prior art reference must provide, either expressly or inherently, each and every limitation of the pending claim. Moreover, the prior art reference must show the identical invention in as complete detail as is contained in the claims with the elements arranged as required by the claims. (M.P.E.P. § 2131).

The Office Action alleges that Yang teaches or suggests all of the claim limitations of claims 29-55. However, based on the arguments presented below, Applicants respectfully submit that Yang fails to teach or suggest one or more of the claim limitations recited in each of claims 29-55.

Specifically, Yang fails to teach or suggest “generating...a consolidated printable representation of the multimedia information electronically stored in the first multimedia document and the multimedia information electronically stored in the second multimedia document based on at least one portion extracted from the first printable representation of the first multimedia document and at least one portion extracted from the second printable representation of the second multimedia document” as recited in amended claim 29. The Office

Action alleges that Yang discloses the above limitation indicating on page 4 that Yang discloses printing clips on paper that include clips from a first collection and clips from a second collection. However, this process in Yang is substantially different from the process recited in amended claim 29.

In particular, there is a difference between extracting portions from video clips to print on paper as in Yang and extracting portions from a plurality of previously generated printable representations of multimedia documents as recited in amended claim 1. Taking video as an example, a stored video file is not in a printable form. Still images first need to be extracted from the video data. The images then need to be arranged in a layout to be printed on paper. This is the process in Yang. If images are desired from multiple collections, then the images are extracted from the selected images in those desired collections and printed to paper in a consolidated page.

In contrast, as recited in amended claim 29, from the multimedia information electronically stored in each of a plurality of multimedia documents, a printable representation for the multimedia document is generated that incorporates printable representations of at least two types of the multimedia information of the multimedia document. For example, the printable representation would incorporate a printable representation of text and a printable representation of video. In another example, the printable representation would incorporate a printable representation of a video clip and a printable representation of audio that accompanies the video clip, or a printable representation of some other type of multimedia information that is electronically stored in the multimedia document.

As recited in amended claim 29, it is from these previously generated printable representations that portions are extracted to generate a consolidated page. Yang does not disclose or suggest generating printable representations of video clips incorporating printable representations of two types of multimedia information as recited in amended claim 29 and then extracting only the desired portions that satisfy selection criteria from these printable representations to create a consolidated page. Yang merely returns directly to the source files that satisfy a user's search and prepares an original printable representation from the sources even though that original includes clips from other collections.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Yang fails to leverage the previously created printable representations as recited in amended claim 29. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Yang fails to disclose each and every claim limitation as recited in amended claim 29. Applicants further respectfully submit that none of the cited references cure the above-discussed deficiencies of Yang, and thus, amended claim 29 is allowable over the cited references.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 38 and 47 are allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of claim 29, and others. Applicants respectfully submit that the dependent claims that depend directly and/or indirectly from independent claims 29, 28, and 47 are also allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of the independent claims. Applicants further respectfully submit that the dependent claims recite additional features that make the dependent claims allowable for additional reasons.

Unless otherwise specified, amendments to the claims are made for the purposes of clarity, and are not intended to alter the scope of the claims or limit any equivalents thereof.

While Applicants do not necessarily agree with the prior art rejections set forth in the Office Action, these amendments may be made to expedite issuance of the Application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue claims to subject matter similar to those pending before the present Amendment in co-pending or subsequent applications.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

Further, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment in connection with this paper to Deposit Account No. 20-1430.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 925-472-5000.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean F. Parmenter, Reg. No. 53,437/
Sean F. Parmenter
Reg. No. 53,437

KILPATRICK TOWNSEND & STOCKTON LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 925-472-5000
Fax: 415-576-0300
SFP:lls
63663598 v1